



## Max M. Kampelman Papers

### **Copyright Notice:**

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/copyright](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).

9/23/83



Public Affairs Counselor  
DAVID MICHAEL WILSON  
Responsible Editor  
RUTH H. VAN HEUVEN

# DAILY BULLETIN

UNITED STATES MISSION (GENEVA), 11 ROUTE DE PREGNY, 1292 CHAMBÉSY, (022) 99 02 11  
UNITED STATES EMBASSY (BERN), 93/95 JUBILÄUMSSTRASSE 3005 BERN, (031) 43 70 11

- S U P P L E M E N T -

NUMBER 25

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1983

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR MAX KAMPELMAN  
AT THE AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL CLUB  
GENEVA, SEPTEMBER 16, 1983

IT HAS OCCURRED TO ME AS I WAS SITTING HERE THAT PERHAPS THE BEST WAY FOR ME TO TRY TO GIVE YOU MY OWN ANALYSIS OF THE MADRID TALKS, IS TO SET FORTH FOR YOU JUST BRIEFLY SOMETHING OF WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY INTENDED BY THE HELSINKI PROCESS, THE AUSPICES OF THE MADRID TALKS, AND SOMETHING ABOUT AMERICAN OBJECTIVES WHEN WE WENT TO MADRID.

YOU ARE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT, WHICH WAS SIGNED IN 1975, WAS THE RESULT OF MANY YEARS OF EAST-WEST NEGOTIATIONS. THE ACT ITSELF FORMALIZED THE RELATIONSHIPS OF THE EAST AND WEST. THAT'S ITS MAIN FOCUS.

THE IDEA FOR THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT INTERESTINGLY ENOUGH WAS ORIGINALLY FORMULATED BY THE SOVIETS WHO PROPOSED THAT THERE BE A EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE. BUT WHEN THEY REFERRED TO A EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE, WHAT THEY HAD IN MIND WAS A SECURITY CONFERENCE IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA WERE NOT A PART, WITH ONLY EUROPEANS PARTICIPATING. THIS IS, OF COURSE, CONSISTENT WITH SOVIET POLICY SINCE THE END OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR WHEN THEIR EFFORT WAS, HAS BEEN AND CONTINUES TO BE TO DISASSOCIATE THE UNITED STATES FROM EUROPE -- AND ITS ALLIES -- AND TO TRY TO HAVE EUROPEANS THINK OF THEMSELVES AS UNIQUELY EUROPEANS, WITH THE SOVIET UNION LOOKING UPON ITSELF AS A EUROPEAN NATION. THE SOVIET UNION WAS THEREFORE ATTEMPTING TO COMMUNICATE THAT THERE IS MORE IN COMMON BETWEEN EUROPEAN STATES, EAST AND WEST, THAN LET'S SAY OUR EUROPEAN FRIENDS AND OURSELVES. THIS WAS THE INITIAL EFFORT.

THERE WAS A FURTHER MOTIVATION BEHIND THIS SOVIET PROPOSAL. SINCE THERE WAS NO TREATY UNTIL THE END OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR, THE SOVIET UNION WANTED TO HAVE SOME METHOD BY WHICH THEIR NEW BOUNDARIES, THEIR NEW BORDERS WOULD BE LEGITIMIZED IN SOME KIND OF INTERNATIONAL FORUM. IT TURNED OUT, HOWEVER, THAT OUR EUROPEAN FRIENDS INSISTED THAT THEY WOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN ANY CONFERENCE IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA WERE NOT AN INTEGRAL PART. THE UNITED STATES WAS SOMEWHAT COOL TO THE WHOLE IDEA, BUT WITH NIXON DEVELOPING, AS OUR PRESIDENT, THE CONCEPT OF DETENTE, IT BECAME INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO RESIST EFFORTS TOWARD NEGOTIATION, TOWARD DIALOGUE, TOWARD UNDERSTANDING, TOWARD ATTEMPTING TO TALK ABOUT COMMON SECURITY ISSUES. OUR EUROPEAN FRIENDS WENT AHEAD AND BEGAN THE NEGOTIATIONS. WE PARTICIPATED SOMEWHAT INDIRECTLY AT FIRST, AND THEN A BIT MORE DIRECTLY, AND FINALLY BY 1975 THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT WAS SIGNED.

I MUST SAY TO YOU THAT AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN -- AND I HAVE TO SAY TO YOU ALSO BY WAY OF COMMENTING A BIT ON THE INTRODUCTION THAT I AM NOT A PROFESSIONAL DIPLOMAT. DIPLOMACY IS NOT MY CAREER. BUT THE FACT OF THE MATTER IS THAT WHEN THE 1975 ACT WAS SIGNED, I, AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN, WAS RATHER CRITICAL PERSONALLY OF IT. I FELT THAT THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT WAS BASED ON A PREMISE OF "DETENTE." INDEED IF YOU READ THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT, THE WORD "DETENTE" APPEARS ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS, I FELT THAT THIS WAS MISLEADING OUR PUBLICS. THERE WAS NO DETENTE IN 1975. I HAD VERY LITTLE CONFIDENCE THAT THE AGREEMENTS WOULD BE LIVED UP TO BY THE SOVIET UNION. BE THAT AS IT MAY, THE ACT WAS SIGNED AND IT HAD A GREAT MANY STRENGTHS TO IT. I WANT TO TAKE A MOMENT TO HIGHLIGHT ITS MOST IMPORTANT STRENGTHS AS I RETROSPECTIVELY RECOGNIZE THEM.

THE EFFECT OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT WAS TO SAY THAT IF WE ARE TO HAVE PEACE AND UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE EAST AND WEST, WE MUST UNDERSTAND THAT PEACE IS MUCH MORE THAN THE ABSENCE OF WAR, IMPORTANT AS THE ABSENCE OF WAR IS. BUT THE ABSENCE OF WAR, WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND, IS ALWAYS A TEMPORARY PHENOMENON. YOU CAN SAY THAT TODAY THERE IS NO WAR AND THANK GOD. THIS IS FINE, BUT IT IS A TEMPORARY PHENOMENON. IT'S NO ASSURANCE OF TOMORROW. THIS AGREEMENT RECOGNIZED THAT IF YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE PEACE, LASTING PEACE, WHICH WAS OUR

OBJECTIVE, THEN IT'S ESSENTIAL TO THINK OF THE TOTALITY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE EAST AND THE WEST. SO THE DISARMAMENT FEATURE, THE SECURITY FEATURE, WAS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THIS AGREEMENT AS WAS THE FEATURE DEALING WITH TRADE AND CULTURAL EXCHANGES AND SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGES. AND AS WAS, AND THIS IS THE SUBJECT OF MY TALK HERE TODAY, THE HUMANITARIAN INGREDIENT.

OUR WESTERN FRIENDS IN EUROPE INSISTED THAT IT WAS INDISPENSABLE TO HAVE COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMANITARIAN AREA, IN HUMAN RIGHTS, IN FAMILY REUNIFICATION. THE SOVIET UNION WAS QUITE EAGER TO OBTAIN THE AGREEMENT, FOR THE REASONS THAT I HAVE STATED, SO IT EVENTUALLY, AFTER A FEW YEARS OF NEGOTIATIONS, AGREED TO ACCEPT THOSE COMMITMENTS IN THE HUMANITARIAN AREA. THIS IS THE ESSENCE OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT.

THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT ALSO SAID THAT SINCE DETENTE WAS TO BE A PROCESS, AN EVOLVING PROCESS, THERE SHOULD BE FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS, AND MADRID IS THE SECOND SUCH FOLLOW-UP MEETING. ONE OF THE RESULTS OF MADRID IS TO HAVE A THIRD FOLLOW-UP MEETING, WHICH IS TO BE IN VIENNA IN 1986.

SO MUCH BY WAY OF BACKGROUND, NOW LET'S ADDRESS OURSELVES TO THE MADRID MEETING. THERE IS A LOGICAL INITIAL QUESTION WHICH HAD TO BE FACED, AND IT HAD TO BE FACED BY OUR GOVERNMENT IN 1980. IT WAS, DO WE GO TO MADRID? HERE IS, AFTER ALL, AN AGREEMENT WHICH WAS CLEARLY BEING VIOLATED BY THE SOVIET UNION IN MOST OF ITS ESSENTIALS. THE SECURITY PART OF IT WAS BEING VIOLATED, OBVIOUSLY BRAZENLY, WITH THE PRESENCE OF MORE THAN 100,000 INVADING SOVIET TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN. AND THE HUMANITARIAN PROVISIONS WERE BEING DEFIED. THOSE INDEPENDENT CITIZENS IN THE SOVIET UNION WHO DID WHAT MANY OTHER CITIZENS IN OTHER COUNTRIES DID, FORM GROUPS TO MONITOR COMPLIANCE, FOUND THEMSELVES HARASSED, JAILED, PUNISHED. POLITICAL DISSIDENTS FOUND THEMSELVES SENT INTO MENTAL HOSPITALS WHERE THEY WERE DRUGGED, INCARCERATED FOR NO REASON OTHER THAN THEY DIFFERED WITH THE REGIME.

BY 1980 WE WERE CLEARLY IN THE MIDST OF ONE OF THE MOST REPRESSIVE PERIODS IN SOVIET HISTORY. ANTI-SEMITISM WAS BECOMING OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT POLICY IN THE SOVIET UNION, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM PRIVATE OPINIONS THAT MIGHT BE HELD. PENTACOSTALISTS, OTHER EVANGELICALS PERSECUTED. THE PICTURE WAS A DISMAL ONE. WE DECIDED IN 1980 THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT WE ATTEND THIS MEETING. IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT WE ATTEND IT IN ORDER TO MAKE CLEAR AT THIS MEETING THE NATURE OF THOSE VIOLATIONS AND TO REAFFIRM THE NECESSITY FOR COUNTRIES THAT UNDERTAKE OBLIGATIONS TO LIVE UP TO THOSE OBLIGATIONS IF THEY WISH TO BE CONSIDERED RESPONSIBLE MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY. THIS IS IN EFFECT WHAT WE ATTEMPTED TO DO IN MADRID.

THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT HAD A UNIQUE INGREDIENT TO IT. NO DECISIONS COULD BE MADE UNLESS THEY WERE MADE BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT. IN MADRID, FOR EXAMPLE, THE DECISION AS TO WHETHER TO MEET TOMORROW MORNING AT 9:00 OR 11:00 OR TO END AT 8:00 AT NIGHT OR WHETHER TO MEET AT ALL THE NEXT DAY HAD TO BE DONE BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT. EVERY WORD HAD TO BE AGREED UPON BY CONSENSUS BEFORE IT WAS AN ACCEPTED WORD. HOW OFTEN I WISHED THAT WE COULD TAKE A VOTE BECAUSE WE WOULD HAVE THE MAJORITY, BUT IT WAS THE UNANIMOUS CONSENT INGREDIENT OF THIS WHICH OF COURSE COMPLICATED THE PROCESS.

NOW WHEN I ASSUMED THE MADRID RESPONSIBILITY, AND AS YOUR CHAIRMAN SAID, I WAS APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT, THE PRESIDENT AT THAT TIME WAS PRESIDENT CARTER AND A DEMOCRAT. I WAS REAPPOINTED BY PRESIDENT REAGAN AFTER HE BECAME PRESIDENT TO CONTINUE WITH THAT RESPONSIBILITY. I HAVE OBVIOUSLY SERVED LONGER NOW UNDER PRESIDENT REAGAN THAN I HAVE UNDER PRESIDENT CARTER. THEREBY ALSO



HANGS AN INTERESTING TALE. WHEN I WAS CONSIDERING WHETHER TO ASSUME THIS RESPONSIBILITY, I ASKED SECRETARY OF STATE VANCE: "CY, HOW LONG IS THIS THING GOING TO LAST? I'VE GOT A LAW FIRM. I AM ASSUMING THAT YOU ARE NOT EXPECTING ME TO RESIGN FROM MY LAW PRACTICE IN ORDER TO ENGAGE IN THIS BRIEF ASSIGNMENT." AND THE ANSWER WAS, "NO, WE ARE NOT EXPECTING YOU TO RESIGN FROM THE LAW FIRM, THERE IS NO OBLIGATION FOR YOU TO RESIGN FROM THE LAW FIRM. THE MEETINGS WILL BEGIN IN SEPTEMBER TO DISCUSS THE AGENDA. THEY MAY LAST A COUPLE OF WEEKS." -- FOOTNOTE: THEY LASTED NINE-AND-A-HALF WEEKS -- "THE MAIN MEETING WILL BEGIN IN NOVEMBER, AND I WOULD EXPECT YOU WOULD BE FREE AFTER A CHRISTMAS RECESS BY LATE FEBRUARY OR EARLY MARCH, FOUR OR FIVE MONTHS." -- FOOTNOTE: IT LASTED THREE YEARS.

WHY? AND THEREBY I THINK YOU GET THE PICTURE OF MADRID. UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF THE SOVIET UNION, AS WE DO, THE WEST DECIDED THAT THE FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA OF THE MADRID MEETING, BEFORE WE WENT INTO DISCUSSING WHERE WE GO FROM HERE, WAS TO DISCUSS THE LOGICAL QUESTIONS, WHERE HAVE WE COME FROM? PROMISES WERE MADE IN 1975. HAVE THEY BEEN LIVED UP TO? SHOULDN'T THAT BE THE FIRST ITEM ON THE AGENDA? WHAT'S BEEN OUR EXPERIENCE WITH THOSE PROMISES BEFORE WE BEGIN DISCUSSING NEW PROMISES?

OBVIOUSLY THE SOVIET UNION UNDERSTOOD WHAT THIS WAS ABOUT AND SO THEY RESISTED THAT ITEM ON THE AGENDA WHICH IS WHY IT TOOK NINE-AND-A-HALF WEEKS BEFORE THEY FOLDED. THEY ONLY CONCEDED AS THE MAIN MEETING WAS OPENING. THEY UNDERSTOOD FULL WELL THAT UNLESS THEY GAVE US WHAT WE REASONABLY WANTED WE COULDN'T START THE MEETING. WE THEREFORE ENGAGED IN MADRID IN WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED BY EXPERTS, AND CORRECTLY CALLED BY EXPERTS, TO BE THE MOST THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE NATURE OF THE SOVIET UNION THAT HAS EVER TAKEN PLACE IN AN INTERNATIONAL FORUM.

WE DID THIS EFFECTIVELY, IN MY OPINION, BECAUSE WE DID IT WITH A UNITED N.A.T.O. ALL SIXTEEN COUNTRIES OF N.A.T.O. WORKED CLOSELY TOGETHER. WE MET IN CAUCUSES FOUR OR FIVE TIMES A WEEK. THERE ARE TIMES WE MET FIVE AND SIX TIMES A DAY IN ORDER TO COORDINATE OUR POLICY. BECAUSE WE KNEW THAT THE SOVIET UNION WAS INTERESTED IN SEPARATING AND DIVIDING US AND WE COULD NOT PERMIT THIS TO HAPPEN.

NOW THE THREE YEARS ARE OVER, THE FINAL SESSION WAS A WEEK AGO TODAY AND DURING THAT MORNING SECRETARY OF STATE SHULTZ SPOKE. TWO DAYS BEFORE THAT ON WEDNESDAY, MR. GROMYKO SPOKE. IN BETWEEN, ON THAT THURSDAY, MR. GROMYKO AND MR. SHULTZ HAD A MEETING. I'M JUMPING TO THAT PERIOD BECAUSE IN MANY WAYS THEY CAPSULE THE STORY OF THE THREE YEARS. THOSE THREE DAYS WERE DOMINATED BY THE KOREAN AIRLINE TRAGEDY WHICH HAD JUST TAKEN PLACE THE WEEK BEFORE. FOR US IN THE WEST, AND NOW I WANT TO SAY A WORD IF I MAY THAT WHEN I REFER TO THE WEST, I'M REALLY TALKING ABOUT MUCH MORE THAN THE SIXTEEN COUNTRIES THAT BELONG TO THIS IMPORTANT MILITARY ALLIANCE CALLED N.A.T.O. I'M ALSO TALKING ABOUT A NUMBER OF THE NEUTRAL COUNTRIES AND MOST PARTICULARLY I'M TALKING ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT WHICH GOVERNS THE COUNTRY IN WHICH WE ARE NOW SITUATED, SWITZERLAND. I CAN SAY TO YOU WITHOUT ANY HESITATION, THAT ON ALL OF THE IMPORTANT ISSUES OF MADRID, MOST PARTICULARLY THE HUMANITARIAN ISSUES, BUT ALSO THE SECURITY ISSUES, WE FOUND SWITZERLAND WORKING WITH US INTIMATELY, CLOSELY, EFFECTIVELY AND AS ONE. I, FOR ONE, THEREFORE WAS NOT A BIT SURPRISED BUT WAS IMMENSELY PLEASED WHEN SWITZERLAND THIS WEEK JOINED IN ITS DEMONSTRATION IN RESPECT TO THE KOREAN AIRLINE TRAGEDY.

BUT THE KOREAN AIRLINE TRAGEDY FOR US CAPSULED EXACTLY WHAT WE HAD BEEN TALKING ABOUT IN MADRID FOR THREE YEARS, WHICH IS THAT THE PROBLEM WITH

SECURITY IN EUROPE TODAY IS THAT THE MOST POWERFUL STATE IN EUROPE, THE SOVIET UNION, IS A STATE WHICH CHOOSES NOT TO BE BOUND BY THE RULES OF RESPONSIBLE BEHAVIOR, EVEN WHERE IT HAS AGREED TO THOSE RULES IN WRITING. THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT IS AN ILLUSTRATION OF IT AND THE KOREAN AIRLINE TRAGEDY IS ANOTHER ILLUSTRATION OF IT. IT'S A GOVERNING GROUP WHICH HAS BEEN ACTING LAWLESSLY. IT'S A GOVERNING GROUP WHICH IS NOT HIGHLY MOTIVATED BY HUMANITARIAN CONSIDERATIONS. ALL OF THESE THINGS DRAMATIZED BY THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT WERE PINPOINTED BY THIS TRAGEDY. SO DURING THESE LAST FEW DAYS OUR SECRETARY OF STATE, FOREIGN MINISTERS OF EVERY SINGLE N.A.T.O. STATE AND THE FOREIGN MINISTERS OF MANY OF THE NEUTRAL STATES MADE THAT POINT OVER AND OVER AGAIN.

IT IS NO SECRET, AND YOU HAVE JUDGED THIS FROM STATEMENTS I HAVE MADE HERE THIS AFTERNOON, THAT I LOOK UPON THE SOVIET UNION AS THE MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO WESTERN VALUES AND SECURITY IN MANY, MANY YEARS. THAT THREAT EXISTS BECAUSE OF ITS AWESOME MILITARY POWER. THAT THREAT ALSO EXISTS BECAUSE THEY HAVE LEARNED FROM LENIN AND FOLLOW THE PRECEPTS OF LENIN IN MANY AREAS, NOT THE LEAST OF WHICH IS THE CORRUPTION OF WORDS. FOR EXAMPLE, EAST GERMANY IS CALLED THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC. WHAT A LUDICROUS CONCEPT: DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC. I DON'T MIND TELLING YOU THAT IN MADRID I NEVER CALLED THAT COUNTRY ANYTHING OTHER THAN EAST GERMANY. THE POINT IS THAT THEY HAVE TAKEN WORDS LIKE "DEMOCRACY" AND "PEOPLE" AND "PEACE" AND THEY HAVE CORRUPTED THOSE WORDS.

IT'S UNDERSTANDABLE THAT LARGE NUMBERS OF MEN AND WOMEN, YOUNG AND OLD, UNDERSTANDING THE CATASTROPHIC DIMENSIONS OF A NUCLEAR WAR, YEARN FOR PEACE. WE DO TOO. MANY, HOWEVER, FIND IT PSYCHOLOGICALLY NECESSARY AND HELPFUL TO BE MISLED BY THOSE WORDS BECAUSE THEY WOULD MUCH RATHER NOT THINK OF THE SOVIET UNION AS AN AGGRESSOR NATION. THEY WOULD MUCH RATHER NOT THINK OF THE AWESOME MILITARY MIGHT AS BEING THERE FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN DEFENSIVE. THEY WOULD MUCH RATHER NOT BELIEVE THE WORDS, THE THREATENING WORDS THAT FREQUENTLY EMANATE FROM THAT SOURCE BECAUSE NOT BELIEVING MAKES LIFE MORE COMFORTABLE FOR THEM.

THE SOVIET UNION BEING A MASTER OF THAT PSYCHOLOGICAL PHENOMENON SPENDS HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN THE BATTLE OF WORDS BECAUSE THEY UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE WORDS, PARTICULARLY SINCE THEY THEN CORRUPT THOSE WORDS. THAT ADDS TO THE DANGER. THAT'S ONE OTHER REASON WHY THE MADRID MEETING WAS SO IMPORTANT BECAUSE WE DID DEFINE THE SOVIET NATURE AND DANGER. WE DID UNDERSTAND IT. I CAN TELL YOU THAT I WAS ON B.B.C. REGULARLY. I WAS ON RADIO LIBERTY, RADIO FREE EUROPE PRACTICALLY EVERY DAY. ALL OF OUR WESTERN DELEGATIONS MADE A MAJOR EFFORT TO GET TO THE PRESS: RUMANIAN TELEVISION WHICH WENT INTO EASTERN EUROPE, YUGOSLAVIAN TELEVISION, BELGIUM PRESS CONFERENCES. I HELD PRESS CONFERENCES FROM HELSINKI BY TELEPHONE, CONSTANTLY REPEATING THE MESSAGE OF THE NATURE OF THE SOVIET UNION, BUT NOT JUST WITH ACCUSATIONS. I AM A LAWYER AND I FAR PREFER TO HAVE DATA. AND SO CONSTANTLY IT WAS THE DATA. IT WAS THE REFERENCE, FOR EXAMPLE, TO SATELLITE FINDINGS OF BETWEEN THREE AND FOUR MILLION PEOPLE IN SOVIET SLAVE-LABOR CAMPS; IT WAS NAMES, DATES OF PEOPLE ARRESTED AND WHAT HAPPENS TO THEM. IT WAS SPECIFICS WITH RESPECT TO THE USE OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE BY THE SOVIET UNION.

AT ONE POINT I REFERRED TO MR. ANDROPOV, WHO SPOKE BEFORE THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY BECAUSE HE FELT THEY WERE LOSING AN IMPORTANT WAR. WHAT WAS THAT WAR? HE SAID WE ARE ENGAGED IN A STRUGGLE FOR THE HEARTS AND MINDS OF BILLIONS OF PEOPLE ON THIS PLANET. LET ME SAY TO YOU FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME THEY WERE THE ONLY ONES FIGHTING THAT WAR. WE WERE NOT ENGAGED IN IT. WE ARE NOW. WE LOOKED UPON THE MADRID MEETING PARTIALLY AS AN INSTRUMENT TRYING TO REACH THE HEARTS AND MINDS OF MANY OF THOSE PEOPLE. THEREFORE, WE TRIED TO REACH MANY OF THEM DIRECTLY.



THAT'S ONE PART OF IT, BUT THE OTHER PART OF IT, AFTER ALL, HAS TO BE HOW DO WE LIVE WITH THIS SOCIETY? YOU CAN'T WISH IT AWAY, AND WE CERTAINLY ARE NOT GOING TO, CANNOT AND SHOULD NOT BLOW IT AWAY. THIS CREATES THE CHALLENGE FOR CIVILIZED SOCIETY. AND SO AT THE SAME TIME AS WE USED THE MADRID MEETING AS A WEAPON IN THIS IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE, DEFINING THE NATURE OF THE SOVIET UNION, WE USED THE MADRID MEETING ALSO AS A WAY OF TRYING TO REACH THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP AND HOPEFULLY TRY TO MAKE SOME IMPACT ON THEM. I CAN TELL YOU THAT I SPENT MORE THAN 350 HOURS, SO MY SECRETARIES TELL ME, IN PRIVATE NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIETS ON ALL KINDS OF ISSUES.

WE REPEATED OUR MESSAGE TO THE SOVIET DELEGATION PRIVATELY AND PUBLICLY, OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN AN EFFORT TO TRY TO PRODUCE SOME KIND OF COMMUNICATION. THE FACT THAT THIS COMMUNICATION WAS NOT SIMPLY FROM THE UNITED STATES BUT FROM A UNITED ALLIANCE ADDED TO THE STRENGTH TO THAT MESSAGE. I DO NOT KNOW WHETHER THE MADRID MEETING WILL PRODUCE ANY MODIFICATION IN SOVIET BEHAVIOR PATTERNS. ALL I KNOW IS THAT WE ARE BETTER TALKING THAN NOT TALKING. I KNOW THAT DIALOGUE IS BETTER THAN NO DIALOGUE, AND SO WE ENGAGED IN THAT DIALOGUE.

WE ALSO CAME OUT WITH AN AGREEMENT, WHICH WAS IN ITSELF IMPORTANT. THE UNITED STATES WAS PREPARED TO COME OUT OF THAT MEETING WITH AN AGREEMENT TO DISAGREE. BUT WE WERE ALSO PREPARED AND PREFERRED TO COME OUT OF THAT MEETING WITH AN AGREEMENT IF IT WAS AN AGREEMENT CONSISTENT WITH OUR VALUES AND OUR DEMANDS. THAT AGREEMENT DID GET PRODUCED. THE IMPORTANCE OF THAT AGREEMENT WAS THAT IT STRENGTHENED IN MANY WAYS THE WORDS OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT.

NOW I WILL COME TO A CLOSE. IT IS LOGICAL TO ASK, "WHAT'S THE GOOD OF WORDS?" OUR ANSWER WAS THAT WORDS ARE IMPORTANT. WHY? BECAUSE WE HOPE FOR AN EVOLVING MECHANISM TOWARD BETTER UNDERSTANDING, ALL OF US RECOGNIZE THAT THIS SITUATION OF TENSION, THIS SITUATION OF THREATS, THIS SITUATION OF ARMAMENT BUILD-UPS IS NOT IN OUR INTEREST OR IN THE INTEREST OF HUMANITY. WE MUST SEEK MUTUALLY ARRIVED-AT AGREEMENTS WITH THE SOVIETS. IN THIS EVOLVING PROCESS TOWARDS SOMETHING BETTER THAN TODAY, WORDS PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE. OF COURSE I SPEAK AS A LAWYER. I HAVE SEEN MANY, MANY OCCASIONS AS A LAWYER WHEN LAWS ARE PASSED AND BY VIRTUE OF THE FACT THAT THE LAWS ARE PASSED WE BEGIN TO GET BEHAVIOR MODIFICATIONS. THAT WAS CERTAINLY THE CASE WITH THE CIVIL RIGHTS EXPERIENCE IN THE UNITED STATES. IN THIS CASE THE WORDS ESTABLISH HIGHER STANDARDS FOR RESPONSIBLE INTERNATIONAL BEHAVIOR. SINCE THOSE STANDARDS ARE STANDARDS WE FAVORED, WE LOOK TO THE DAY WHEN ALL NATIONS WILL BEGIN OBSERVING THOSE STANDARDS.

WHY THEREFORE THROW OUT THOSE STANDARDS, IF THEY ARE STANDARDS IN OUR INTEREST? WHAT IS IMPORTANT IS THAT WE KEEP INSISTING THAT THOSE COUNTRIES THAT DO NOT LIVE UP TO THOSE STANDARDS BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE. AND SO I WOULD SUMMARIZE BY SAYING TO YOU THAT WHAT'S HAPPENED TO THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT IS THAT IT IS NO LONGER THE INSTRUMENT THAT THE SOVIETS INTENDED IT TO BE, AN INSTRUMENT OF DETENTE, FALSE DETENTE, AN INSTRUMENT DESIGNED TO LULL THE WEST INTO THINKING WE ARE IN A PERIOD OF PEACE AND THEREFORE DO NOT NEED TO RESPOND TO THEIR THREAT. THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT HAS NOW BEEN TURNED INTO AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE WEST. AN INSTRUMENT FOR WESTERN VALUES, AN INSTRUMENT TO TRY TO PERSUADE OTHERS TO BEHAVE IN A RESPONSIBLE MANNER.

THANK YOU.

I AM OPEN TO QUESTIONS IF ANYONE DOES HAVE QUESTIONS.

Q: WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A "FINAL ACT" WHICH IS WHAT THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT WAS, AND A TREATY?

A: NOBODY REALLY KNOWS WHAT "FINAL ACT" MEANS. A TREATY IS AN AGREEMENT WHICH IN OUR CASE WOULD HAVE TO BE RATIFIED BY TWO-THIRDS OF THE SENATE. IT COVERS AREAS WHICH OUR SENATE WOULD CLAIM HAS TO BE SUBJECT TO DOMESTIC LAWS, STATE LAWS RATHER THAN FEDERAL LAWS AND THEREFORE WOULD GET US INVOLVED IN A KIND OF CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK THAT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT EVER TO RESOLVE. AND YET WE HAVE AN AGREEMENT SIGNED BY THE HEADS OF STATE. PRESIDENT FORD FLEW OUT TO HELSINKI AND SIGNED IT. BREZHNEV AFFIXED HIS SIGNATURE TO IT. SOMEBODY CAME UP WITH THE IDEA, THAT IF WE CAN'T CALL IT A TREATY AND WE CAN'T CALL IT AN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT, LET'S CALL IT A FINAL ACT. THERE WAS NOBODY AROUND WHO COULD SAY IT'S NOT A FINAL ACT BECAUSE WE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT A FINAL ACT WAS. SO THAT'S HOW THAT CAME INTO BEING. WHAT IS ACTUALLY HAPPENING HOWEVER IS WE ARE TAKING THE POSITION THAT AN AGREEMENT SIGNED BY THE HEAD OF STATE IS NO LESS AN OBLIGATION OF THE SIGNATORY. ONE OF THE STRENGTHS OF THE MADRID MEETING IS THAT WE HAVE HELD THEM ACCOUNTABLE AND I THINK THAT'S THE DIRECTION IN WHICH IT'S NOW MOVING. I DON'T REALLY BELIEVE THE SOVIET UNION EXPECTED THAT THEY WOULD EVER BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR IT.

Q: WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO COME OUT OF THE SECURITY-BUILDING MEASURES CONTAINED IN THE MADRID FINAL DOCUMENT?

A: ONE OF THE THINGS WE DID IN MADRID IS PROVED THAT BETWEEN MADRID AND VIENNA WE WILL HAVE A SERIES OF OTHER MEETINGS. FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE AN EXPERTS MEETING ON HUMAN RIGHTS, WE HAVE AN EXPERTS MEETING ON THE REUNIFICATION OF FAMILIES, WE HAVE A CULTURAL FORUM, WE HAVE A MEETING ON MILITARY SECURITY, AND THE QUESTION RELATED TO MILITARY SECURITY. I HAVE REPEATED HERE A FEW TIMES THAT MADRID TRIED TO HOLD NATIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR BEHAVIOR. THE REASON WHY WE PUSHED SO HARD FOR ALL OF THOSE MEETINGS IS BECAUSE WE DID NOT WANT TO BE IN A POSITION WHERE WE EXPRESS OUR CONCERN WHILE MADRID IS ON. MADRID COMES TO AN END AND THEN WE WAIT THREE YEARS BEFORE WE EXPRESS OUR CONCERNS AGAIN. WE WANTED TO HOLD THESE MEETINGS PERIODICALLY AND THEY ARE ACCOUNTABILITY MEETINGS ON HUMAN RIGHTS, CULTURAL FORUM, ETC.

FOR MANY THE MOST IMPORTANT OF THOSE MEETINGS IS A MEETING THAT WILL BEGIN IN JANUARY ON MILITARY SECURITY ISSUES. IT IS INTERESTING THAT THE SOVIETS CAME WITH A PROPOSAL CALLING FOR A DISARMAMENT MEETING. THE WEST CAME IN WITH A PROPOSAL ORIGINALLY CONCEIVED OF BY THE FRENCH CALLING FOR A MEETING ON THE ISSUE OF SURPRISE MILITARY ATTACK, WHICH IS AN ISSUE OF GREAT CONCERN TO ALL OF US. IN THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT IT IS AGREED THAT THERE WILL BE MILITARY CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES TO DEAL WITH THAT PROBLEM, BUT THEY COULD ONLY AGREE ON ONE. THEY COULD ONLY AGREE ON A PROVISION THAT WHEN MANEUVERS TOOK PLACE INVOLVING MORE THAN 25,000 TROOPS, THE ACT OF THOSE MANEUVERS SHOULD BE NOTIFIED TO EVERYBODY AT LEAST 21 DAYS AHEAD OF TIME WITH CERTAIN SPECIFICS. IT'S THE ONLY ONE THEY WOULD AGREE UPON. BUT EVERYBODY UNDERSTOOD THAT IF WE WERE REALLY EFFECTIVELY ADDRESSING SURPRISE MILITARY ATTACK WE HAVE TO GO INTO GREATER DEPTH INTO THE ISSUE OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES. THAT'S WHAT THIS MEETING WHICH WILL OPEN UP IN STOCKHOLM IN JANUARY IS DESIGNED TO DO.

LET ME ALSO SAY, WHICH WILL BE OF INTEREST TO YOU, THAT IN 1975 THE FINAL ACT PRACTICALLY EXEMPTS THE SOVIET UNION FROM THE COVERAGE OF THAT SINGLE 25,000 TROOP MANEUVER NOTIFICATION. IT PROVIDED THAT ANY MANEUVERS ONLY WITHIN THE FIRST 250 KILOMETERS OF THE SOVIET UNION WHEN WE CAME INTO MADRID, WE MEANING THE WEST, WOULD REQUIRE NOTIFICATION. WE SAID THAT IF WE WERE GOING TO HAVE THIS CONFERENCE ON SURPRISE MILITARY ATTACK IT WAS ESSENTIAL THAT ALL OF EUROPE BE COVERED, WHICH WOULD MEAN THAT PART OF THE SOVIET UNION WHICH GOES TO THE URALS. THE FINAL AGREEMENT DOES PROVIDE FOR ALL OF EUROPE INCLUDING THAT PART GOING TO THE URALS TO BE COVERED. PREPARATIONS ARE NOW UNDERWAY WITH



RESPECT TO THAT SECURITY CONFERENCE TO BEGIN IN STOCKHOLM. WE ARE TAKING IT VERY SERIOUSLY. WE HAD A PACKAGE IN 1980 OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES. OUR MILITARY IS NOW SERIOUSLY REEXAMINING ALL OF THAT PACKAGE. WE EXPECT THAT WITHIN A MATTER OF A FEW WEEKS, N.A.T.O. WILL HOLD SOME SPECIAL MEETINGS COORDINATING THE WESTERN APPROACH ON THIS MILITARY PACKAGE, SEEING THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEY HAVE TO BE MODIFIED. I HAVE VERY LITTLE DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT WHEN WE COME TO STOCKHOLM WE WILL COME UNITED WITH THE SAME PACKAGE JUST AS WE CAME TO MADRID UNITED WITH THE SAME PACKAGE OF WHAT WE WERE LOOKING FOR.

Q: YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU HAD BEEN INTERVIEWED BY EUROPEAN MEDIA DURING THE CONFERENCE, ON MANY OCCASIONS TO EXPLAIN THE TRUTH ABOUT THE C.S.C.E. IMPLEMENTATION BY COUNTRIES. MAYBE IT WAS AN OMISSION ON YOUR PART, BUT DID YOU TALK AS WELL TO AMERICAN MEDIA?

A: I MENTIONED THE EUROPEAN FORUM PRIMARILY BECAUSE THIS IS A EUROPEAN CONFERENCE. PUBLIC OPINION IN EUROPE IS THE BIG BATTLEGROUND NOW ON THE WHOLE QUESTION OF THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE PERSHING AND THE CRUISE MISSILES. THE SOVIET UNION IS ATTEMPTING TO PERSUADE EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS NOT TO DEPLOY THAT VERY ESSENTIAL DETERRENT. THERE WAS OBVIOUSLY GREATER PRESS ATTENTION IN EUROPE THAN THERE WAS IN THE UNITED STATES. THE AMERICAN PRESS INTEREST WAS SPORADIC. IT EXISTED. DURING CRISIS SITUATIONS THE CAMERA CREWS FROM THE NETWORKS WOULD SHOW UP IN MADRID. CERTAINLY DURING THESE LAST FEW DAYS THE CAMERA CREWS FROM THE NETWORKS WERE THERE. OTHER THAN THAT, THERE WAS SOME COVERAGE IN THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE LOS ANGELES TIMES. THE ASSOCIATED PRESS WOULD COVER IT AND THEN YOU WOULD NEVER KNOW WHERE AN ITEM WOULD APPEAR. IT MIGHT COME UP IN THE ALBUQUERQUE NEWSPAPER, IT MIGHT COME UP IN DES MOINES, IOWA. I WOULD HAVE LIKED TO GET MORE COVERAGE, BUT I DIDN'T THINK THAT OUR TARGET WAS AS MUCH THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC OPINION AS IT WAS EUROPEAN. I EMPHASIZED MORE THE EUROPEAN PRESS, BUT I WAS AVAILABLE TO ALL. THERE IS OF COURSE, AS YOU SAY, A GREAT DEAL OF HO HUM IN OUR COUNTRY STILL ABOUT HELSINKI. BUT THERE IS A GREAT DEAL MORE SENSITIVITY ABOUT IT THAN THERE HAS BEEN.

Q: DID YOUR POSITION ON THE C.S.C.E., AND IN PARTICULAR THE SOVIET UNION'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE C.S.C.E., CHANGE SINCE YOU TOOK UP THE JOB OF HEAD OF THE U. S. DELEGATION?

A: MY POSITION DID NOT. I'VE BEEN SAYING BEFORE FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME THAT THE SOVIET UNION IS A THREAT TO WORLD PEACE. I WAS A FOUNDING MEMBER AS A DEMOCRAT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER. THIS WAS A COMMITTEE WHICH WAS FORMED IN 1975 AND 1976 IN ORDER TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE DEFENSE BUDGET.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. (END TRANSCRIPT)

